DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 358 792 HE 026 523

AUTHOR Gill, Wanda E.
TITLE "Conversations about Accreditation: Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools" Focusing on Outcomes Assessment in the Accreditation Process.
PUB DATE 12 Jun 93
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Double Feature Conference on Assessment and Continuous Quality Improvement of the American Association for Higher Education (Chicago, IL, June 12, 1993).
PUB TYPE Reports - General (140) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Accreditation (Institutions); Accrediting Agencies; *College Outcomes Assessment; *Colleges; Federal Legislation; Federal Regulation; Government Role; Government School Relationship; Higher Education; Institutional Evaluation; Outcomes of Education; *Self Evaluation (Groups)
IDENTIFIERS Higher Education Act Amendments 1992; Middle States Association Commission Higher Educ: National Education Goals 1990

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the role of outcomes assessment in the higher education accreditation process of the Middle States Association Commission on Higher Education region and considers future trends suggested by recent federal legislation. The recent reauthorization of the Higher Education Act stipulates an evolving role for the federal government in accreditation. Four current Commission publications on outcomes assessment are briefly summarized. In addition the paper presents results of a study of outcomes assessment in institutions in the region. The study consisted of two surveys, one for institutions beginning the outcomes assessment process and one for institutions with assessment plans in place. Three hundred of the 506 institutional members returned one of the two questionnaires. An analysis of self-study designs submitted by institutions during 1992 and 1993 found an increasing emphasis on outcomes assessment. In addition, all of the 1993-94 self-studies on file to date incorporate assessment data. The paper discusses the importance of outcomes assessment in light of the National Education Goals, particularly Goal #5 which calls for all citizens to be literate and able to exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship. A final discussion highlights differences between Commission positions with regard to assessment and constructs and procedures outlined in draft federal regulations. Copies of the outcomes assessment surveys are appended. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED358792

"CONVERSATIONS ABOUT ACCREDITATION: MIDDLE STATES ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS" FOCUSING ON OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT IN THE ACCREDITATION PROCESS

by

Dr. Wanda E. Gill

A Presentation for the
1993 American Association for Higher Education
Double Feature Conference on Assessment
and Continuous Quality Improvement

Saturday, June 12, 1993
8:15 - 9:15 a.m.

HE026523

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Wanda E. Gill

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

"CONVERSATIONS ABOUT ACCREDITATION:
MIDDLE STATES ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS"
FOCUSING ON OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT
IN THE ACCREDITATION PROCESS

by

Dr. Wanda E. Gill

A Presentation for the
1993 American Association for Higher Education
Double Feature Conference on Assessment
and Continuous Quality Improvement

Saturday, June 12, 1993
8:15 - 9:15 a.m.

"Conversations About Accreditation..." will cover the role of outcomes assessment in both the accreditation process in the Middle States Association Commission on Higher Education region and in future trends, as evidenced by Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act which stipulates the evolving role of the federal government in accreditation. More specifically, the presentation will cover outcomes assessment in Commission publications, the results of a survey of outcomes assessment in institutions in the region, and institutional uses of outcomes assessment in the accreditation proccess in 1992-93 and 1993-94. The Commission's position on the National Education Goals that relate to post-secondary education and the Commission response to a draft of procedures and criteria for the recognition of accrediting agencies will also be covered.

HE 026 523

The Commission publication Framework for Outcomes Assessment addresses the ways in which outcomes assessment is used in the accreditation process. This publication complements two other

MSA/CHE publications that are useful to institutions undergoing the accreditation process: Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education: Standards for Accreditation and Designs for Excellence: Handbook for Institutional Self-Study.

Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education: Standards for Accreditation relates outcomes assessment to the demonstration of institutional effectiveness. The document speaks to an outcomes assessment plan which may include qualitative and quantitative measures of student achievement, research, scholarship, service and other indices of effectiveness. The publication highlights the possibility of outcomes assessment data directed at the fiscal and planning areas as well as at its educational programs. The degrees of excellence in the outcomes assessment plan can be directly related to the quality of the linkages to planning and the budget.

Design for Excellence: Handbook for Institutional Self-Study highlights the institution's use of qualitative and quantitative procedures, as well as instruments, to evaluate how effectively it achieves its objectives. Data analysis for institutional improvement on an on-going basis is stressed.

The Commission's outcomes assessment publication, Framework for Outcomes Assessment, suggests a teaching/learning/assessment/improvement loop that occurs in a given campus climate. The loop is student focused with the questions being posed:

1. What should students learn?

2. How well are they learning it?

3. How does the institution know?

These questions are posed in the area of curriculum. The Commission's outcomes assessment publication focuses on general education, other academic programs and individual course offerings.

The library support program is linked to academics by posing questions directed at information literacy. Library research skills are seen as critical links, enabling students to master directed learning related to the curriculum as well as individually pursued topics independently.

Through the measurement of outcomes, evaluators have a better feel for input measures. It is the value of the inputs as interpreted and used by the processing unit, the student, that determines the degree of fit in the learning environment. The institution's challenge is to assess what was learned, thereby demonstrating the use of outcomes assessment data to prove institutional effectiveness. If the library, teaching materials, teacher's style and methods fit the learner, even if the learner is a non-traditional student, there may be a good fit of campus climate with the learner. The assessment plan, including method of assessment, can be a critical factor in determining institutional effectiveness.

Most institutions in the Middle States region routinely report data to federal and state governments. Such data is often used in the accreditation process to demonstrate institutional effectiveness. Enrollment data, transfer rates, faculty statistics, budget trends and retention or attrition and graduation rates are usually collected.

The Framework for Outcomes Assessment is focused yet broad enough to allow for a wide range of types of assessment plans. Further, the publication demonstrates the on-going and changing nature of assessment. Data that was appropriate with one type of institutional mission may not be appropriate if the mission changes; e.g., teacher education colleges that become more focused on a business curriculum may have less need to incorporate data from the National Teacher's Exam into institutional plans. This example demonstrates a use of outcomes assessment data in the planning process.

Two years ago, the Commission mailed two surveys to its members. Survey A was designed for institutions beginning the outcomes assessment process. Survey B was intended for institutions with assessment plans in place. Fifty-nine percent (59%) or three hundred (300) of the five-hundred-six (506) institutional members returned one of the two questionnaires. Eighty-four (84) indicated they had an outcomes assessment process "in place" and two-hundred-sixteen (216) identified themselves as

"beginning" the process.

Of those "beginning" outcomes assessment, 26% were two-year colleges, 30% were liberal arts colleges, 22% were comprehensive institutions, 2% were doctorate granting institutions, 2% were research institutions, and 14% were specialized institutions. 4% were not identifiable by institutional type. Of these respondents, 49% were public institutions compared to 41% public institutions in the Middle States region and 45% were private institutions compared to 59% private institutions in the region.

Of respondents with outcomes assessment plans in place, 38% were two-year colleges; 16% were from liberal arts colleges; 26% were comprehensive institutions; 2% were doctorate-granting institutions; 4% were research institutions; and 8% were specialized institutions. 6% were not identifiable by institutional type. 60% were public and 34% were private institutions. 60% of these respondents had assessment plans in place for more than two years and 40% had plans in place for more than three years.

The survey of institutions beginning the outcomes assessment process yielded the following responses.

Questions	Yes	No	No Response	In Progress	Will Not Use
1. Working on Assessment Plan	196 (90.3%)	20 (9.2%)	1 (.5%)		
2. Operative Statements of Mission, Goals and Objectives	96 (44.2%)	21 (9.7%)	3 (1.4%)	97 (44.7%)	
3. Institutional, Program & Course Goal Statements	33 (15.2%)	60 (27.6%)	5 (2.3%)	119 (54.8%)	
4. Inventory of Assessment Instrument & Activities In Place	49 (22.6%)	47 (21.7%)	2 (.9%)	119 (54.8%)	
5. Assessment of Instruments/Activities	9 (4.1%)	104 (47.9%)	2 (.9%)	102 (47.0%)	
6. New Measures Determined	12 (5.5%)	72 (33.2%)	6 (2.8%)	127 (58.5%)	
7. Consideration of Nationally Normed Instruments	14 (6.5%)	55 (25.3%)	6 (2.8%)	89 (41.0%)	52 (24.0%)
8. Locally Developed Tests/Surveys	27 (12.4%)	61 (28.1%)	6 (2.8%)	119 (54.8%)	4 (1.8%)
9. Scope & Scheduling	22 (10.1%)	74 (34.1%)	6 (2.8%)	115 (53.0%)	
10. Decided Who Responds to Tests or Surveys	28 (12.9%)	91 (41.9%)	8 (3.7%)	90 (41.5%)	
11. Decision on Program Review in Assessment Plan	66 (30.4%)	58 (26.7%)	8 (3.7%)	85 (39.2%)	
12. How & When Test Data/ Surveys Analyzed	66 (30.4%)	58 (26.7%)	8 (3.7%)	85 (39.2%)	
13. How Assessment Results Communicated to Community	17 (7.8%)	111 (51.2%)	5 (2.3%)	84 (38.7%)	
14. Integration of Outcomes Assessment Into On-Going MSA Self-Study	52 (24%)	51 (23.5%)	102 (47%)	12 (5.5%)	

The survey of institutions with assessment plans in place yielded the following responses.

Questions	1-2 Years	2-3 Years	3+ Years	No Response
1. Assessment Plan	34 (40.5%)	16 (19.0%)	34 (40.5%)	

	1 None	2	3 Moderate	4	5 Full	No Response
2. Faculty Involved In Development of Outcomes Assessment Plan	1 (1.2%)	11 (13.1%)	28 (33.3%)	27 (32.1%)	17 (20.1%)	
3. Academic Administrators Involvement In Development		10 (11.9%)	12 (14.3%)	32 (38.1%)	28 (33.3%)	2 (2.4%)
4. Institutional Researchers Involvement In Development	10 (11.9%)	8 (9.5%)	19 (22.6%)	13 (15.5%)	33 (39.3%)	1 (1.2%)

5. Assessment Plan Includes:	Yes	No
a) Enrollment Data	76 (90.5%)	8 (9.5%)
b) Graduation/Retention/Attrition Data	79 (94.0%)	5 (6.0%)
c) Nationally-Normed Diagnostic Test at Entry	52 (61.9%)	32 (38.1%)
d) Locally Developed Test at Entry	55 (65.5%)	29 (34.5%)
e) Nationally-Normed Follow-Up Diagnostic Test Data After Remediation	30 (35.7%)	54 (64.3%)

f) Nationally-Normed Locally-Developed Test After Remediation	40 (47.6%)	44 (52.4%)
g) Nationally-Normed Test(s) of General Intellectual Skills	21 (25.0%)	63 (75.0%)
h) Locally-Developed Test(s) of General Intellectual Skills	26 (31.0%)	58 (69.0%)
i) Student Satisfaction Surveys	77 (91.7%)	7 (8.3%)
j) Campus Climate Surveys	50 (59.5%)	34 (40.5%)
k) Values/Ethics Surveys	22 (26.2%)	62 (73.8%)
l) Student Motivation Surveys	18 (21.4%)	66 (78.6%)
m) Classroom Survey	42 (50%)	42 (50%)
n) Other Data	13 (15.5%)	71 (84.5%)
o) Skills Testing Data	51 (60.7%)	33 (39.3%)
p) Data on Exams at Program Completion	51 (60.7%)	33 (39.3%)
q) Student Licensure Exams Data	66 (78.6%)	18 (21.4%)
r) Articulation Agreements Data	18 (21.4%)	66 (78.6%)
s) Professional and Graduate School Acceptance Data	34 (40.5%)	50 (59.5%)
t) Portfolio Assessment Data	30 (35.7%)	54 (64.3%)
u) Case Studies Data	8 (9.5%)	76 (90.5%)
v) Exit Interviews Data	43 (51.2%)	41 (48.8%)
w) Alumni Surveys Data	73 (86.9%)	11 (13.1%)
x) Other Data	22 (26.2%)	62 (73.8%)
y) Assessment Program Review	74 (88.1%)	9 (10.7%)

None	10%	20%	35%	50%	65%	80%	100%
4 (4.8%)	5 (6.0%)	10 (11.9%)	4 (4.8%)	5 (6.0%)	7 (8.3%)	4 (4.8%)	33 (39.3%)

aa. Who analyzes test/survey results? (check all that apply)

	Yes	No
-- individual faculty members	55 (65.5%)	29 (34.5%)
-- faculty committees	61 (72.6%)	23 (27.4%)
-- academic administrators	72 (85.7%)	12 (14.3%)
-- institutional researchers	25 (29.9%)	59 (70.2%)
-- Board of Trustees	19 (22.6%)	65 (77.4%)
-- Students	14 (16.7%)	70 (83.3%)
-- alumni/ae	6 (7.1%)	78 (92.9%)
-- area employers	8 (9.5%)	76 (90.5%)
-- others	13 (15.5%)	71 (84.5%)

bb. Summaries of assessment results are communicated to the campus through? (check as many as apply)

	Yes	No
a) formal report(s)	67 (79.8%)	17 (20.2%)
b) informally or selectively	54 (64.3%)	30 (35.7%)
c) individual request	13 (15.5%)	71 (84.5%)
d) MSA self-study	42 (50.0%)	42 (50.0%)

cc. Extent to which institutional goals and objectives have been modified due to student outcomes assessment:

1 Not At All	2	3 Moderately	4	5 Comprehensively	No Response
15 (17.9%)	22 (26.2%)	26 (31.0%)	13 (15.5%)	2 (2.4%)	6 (7.1%)

The self-study designs submitted by institutions during 1992 and 1993 indicate an increasing emphasis on outcomes assessment. The 1992-93 self-studies of all of the campuses of Inter American University of Puerto Rico incorporated assessment data. Dowling College selected a comprehensive self-study design with emphases in five areas, one of which was outcomes. Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary conducted a comprehensive self-study with emphasis on institutional effectiveness and outcomes along with four other areas. Edinboro University picked the comprehensive self-study with an emphasis on assessment and three other areas. Messiah College picked the Special Topics Self-Study Design with a focus on outcomes assessment and three other areas. Orange County Community College did a comprehensive self-study with emphases on outcomes effectiveness and four other areas. Reading Area Community College did a comprehensive self-study with an emphasis on outcomes assessment and two other areas. These examples of community, four-year and specialized institutions incorporating outcomes assessment as an emphasis area in the comprehensive self-study or as a special topics design area, demonstrate the growing importance of the use of outcomes assessment data in documenting institutional effectiveness. All of the 1993-94 self-studies on file to date incorporate assessment data. Most institutions incorporate outcomes data into the comprehensive design. Two institutions, Mercy College and Nassau Community College, are conducting comprehensive self-studies that have special foci, including assessment. Many self-studies that focus on planning have separate

chapters on outcomes assessment. There appears to be a modest increase in the number of institutions that are examining their assessment plans separately. This seems to support the Commission survey conducted two years ago that indicates that most responding colleges and universities were in the process of developing assessment plans.

There are a number of factors that facilitate or hinder the development of the institution's outcomes assessment plan. Most are the same factors. The current status of assessment in the Middle States Association Commission on Higher Education region is depicted below.

Facilitate Outcomes Assessment	Current Status of Assessment	Hindrances
1) Leadership from the CEO.	1) Most institutions have institutional research offices or persons.	1) Budget.
2) A few people on campus are positively disposed towards conducting assessments.	2) Most institutions are developing information systems that are appropriate to their needs.	2) Not asking right questions. Questions on Assessment Validity.
3) Campus Environment.	3) Some institutions	3) Database may

	have follow-up studies of students.	not be structured for assessment.
4) Emphasis at the national level.	4) Some institutions have student retention, graduation and placement rates.	4) Personnel limitations.
5) State mandates.	5) Many have studies of retention and/or transfer rates.	5) Lack of adequate planning process.
6) Accrediting agency requirements on assessment.	6) Many have program review procedures, information on courses offered, grades, etc.	6) Lack of clarity of mission, goals, and objectives.
7) Clear mission, goals and objectives.		7) Lack of assessment techniques.
8) Direct relation- and links with institutional planning.		8) Lack of ship policy, environment for assessment.

9) Budget.

9) Faculty resistance to assessment. How will results be used?

10) Campus Environment.

Outcomes assessment will become increasingly important under the Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. The Commission's position, presented to the National Education Goals Panel, is particularly important. The group convened in Portland on May 1, 1993 to discuss National Education Goal #5 ("By the year 2,000, every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.") In the testimony, presented by Associate Director, Dr. John H. Erickson, the following points were made.

(1) Generally speaking, Goal 5 is compatible with the missions of most postsecondary institutions.

(2) Program degree completion rates are not, when used alone, useful indicators of institutional effectiveness, particularly for community colleges where life-long learning is valued. Student preparedness for postsecondary education has been

supported on many four-year as well as two-year campuses with remedial instruction and supportive resources that create opportunity for accessing higher education institutions. Such places need not be penalized by faulty assumptions based on lower completion rates.

(3) MSA publications promote the development of a comprehensive assessment plan using nationally normed tests as well as locally developed instruments.

(4) Assessment can best be viewed in terms of how it is linked to demonstrating the fulfillment of institutional mission, goals, and objectives through strategic planning that is based on realistic budget projections.

(5) The primary issue is whether the proposed national assessment measures will increase student learning through improved programs. Institutions have consistently provided the most applicable assessment plans, based on their missions, students and programs.

The Commission, consistent with its publications, particularly Framework for Outcomes Assessment, affirms the following:

1. "Each institution has the responsibility for developing

assessment measures that are appropriate to its stated mission and goals."

2. "Faculty involvement and ownership is critical to effective assessment."

3. "The reason for assessing institutional programs and services is improvement in student learning."

Assessment is in the loop linking teaching, learning, programs and institutional improvement.

A review of a 5/6/93 draft of "Part 602--Secretary's Procedures and Criteria for the Recognition of Accrediting Agencies" indicates that once an accrediting agency submits a written application for initial or renewed recognition by the Secretary, the Secretary may then conduct unannounced as well as announced visits not only to the accrediting agency but also to the institutions it accredits. On such a visit, outcomes assessment data may be reviewed. The MSA/CHE defines outcomes assessment as gathering and evaluating "... both quantitative and qualitative data which demonstrates congruence between the institution's mission, goals and objectives and the actual outcomes of its educational programs and activities." "...the ultimate goal of outcomes assessment is the improvement of teaching and learning." Indeed, in like manner, the draft document speaks to self studies

that focus on "... qualitative assessments, quantitative measures of student achievement, and continuing improvement of educational quality." The draft further stipulates that accrediting agencies must provide to the institution a detailed report on its review assessing the institution's performance with respect to student achievement. The draft requires institutions to assess the educational achievement of students using:

(a) Student grades, grade point averages, theses, portfolios;
(b) Results of admissions tests for graduate or professional school or other standardized tests;
(c) Transfer rates to institutions offering higher level programs; and
(d) Job placement rates, completion rates, results of licensing examinations, evaluations by employers, follow-up studies of alumni, and other recognized measures of educational outcomes."

The problem is that this is a narrow construct and is inconsistent with Commission documents that allow for actual assessment of what students learn. These are proxy measures of what students know, as we indicate in Framework for Outcomes Assessment.

The federal draft goes on to say that this outcomes data should be used to improve student achievement with respect to the

degrees or certificates offered. Accreditation agencies are then expected to "...systematically monitor(ing) institutional or program performance with respect to student achievement to determine if performance is consistent with both the institution's or program's vision and objectives and the agency's objective measures of performance of student achievement...." Unlike the proposed procedures and criteria, the Commission believes institutions are expected to have an assessment plan in place, to conduct strategic planning and reevaluate their own processes. Peer evaluators, during institutional self-study and as a part of the Periodic Review process, examine institutional performance against mutually agreed upon Commission standards.

To assist institutions as they try to determine where they are with outcomes assessment and how outcomes assessment data can be incorporated during the self-study process, the following form is under development. Such a form can be copied and disseminated to different departments and offices as they conceptualize how they wish to use outcomes assessment data in the self-study. The form is intended as an instrument to facilitate institutional thinking rather than as a prescriptive tool.

Whether institutions are undergoing self-study in preparation for a team visit or preparing a Periodic Review Report for the Middle States Association Commission on Higher Education, outcomes assessment has become an integral component of the self-study

process. External audiences, like the federal government, are posing more questions about the relationship of the institution's outcomes assessment model to mission, goals, objectives, planning and budget. As we approach the 21st century, we are more aware of the on-going concern for institutional improvement through the use of outcomes assessment data.

j:521article.weg

Outcomes Assessment Survey

Section I - Components of Institutional Outcomes Assessment Plan

_____ _____

Institution _____

Address

_____ _____

Name of Person Completing Form **Title**

Directions: Please check **YES**, **NO** or **NC (Not Collected)** for the following statements.

	YES	NO	NC
1. This institution has a written outcomes assessment plan. If YES, check all that apply. The current plan includes:			
a. Mission and Goals			
b. Institutional Program			
c. Student Performance			
d. Faculty Performance			
e. Student Support Services Measures			
f. Fiscal Accountability Data			
g. Trustee/Board Impact Data			
h. Community Service Data			
i. Other (Describe) _____			
_____			
2. This institution is currently developing a written outcomes assessment plan.			
3. The institution collects data on a "need to know" basis for required federal or state or county or other reports.			
4. Currently, outcomes assessment data collection is fragmented.			
5. Outcomes assessment data is collected but not analyzed.			
6. Outcomes assessment data is collected and analyzed but not used for decision making.			
7. The outcomes assessment plan is reassessed at least every five years.			
8. This institution has developed a list of peer institutions. (Please attach the list of peer institutions.)			
9. Peer institutions are currently used for comparisons on the following: (Please check all that apply.)			
a. Student Retention Rates			
b. Student Graduation Rates			
c. Faculty Workload			
d. Faculty Salaries			
e. Other (Describe) _____			
_____			

Section II - Mission and Goals

Institution

Address

Name of Person Completing Form

Title

Directions: Please indicate whether the following types of data are COL (Collected), NC (Not Collected) or USED by your institution.

	COL	NC	USED
1. Data on:			
a. the number of students by program type.			
b. course offerings that support mission.			
c. community workshops related to mission.			
d. student learning objectives related to institutional goals.			
2. Non-quantifiable data. (Describe) (e.g. political considerations, attitudes towards asssessment, leadership factors, etc.)			
_____			
_____			
3. Other (Describe)			
_____			

Section III - Instructional Program

Institution

Address

Name of Person Completing Form

Title

Directions: Please indicate whether the following types of data are **COL (Collected), NC (Not Collected)** or **USED** by your institution.

1. The following types of data are collected or used to assess the institutional program:	COL	NC	USED
a. Student course satisfaction surveys			
b. Student grades			
c. Student course enrollment statistics			
d. Practicum experience surveys completed by supervisors			
e. Field experience surveys			
f. Percentage of students who intend to complete one or more courses only			
g. Percentage of students who intend to complete a certificate program			
h. Percentage of entering students completing the program			
i. Percentage of entering graduates placed in program related jobs			
j. Percent of graduates accepted into next degree level programs			
k. Student Performance in the next degree level program			
l. Assessment of:			
1. Portfolio programs			
2. Contract programs			
3. Other individualized study programs			
Other (Describe) _____			
_____			

Directions: The following questions require a **YES** or **No** answer.	YES		NO
2. Faculty assessment of the quality of the instructional program is an informal process.			
3. Faculty assessment of the quality of the instructional program is a formal process.			
4. The responsibility for the assessment of the instructional program rests with: (Please check all that apply.)			
a. The Provost			
b. The Vice President for Academic Affairs			
c. The Dean of the Faculty			
d. The Department chair			
e. Faculty			
f. Committee(Name) _____			
g. Other _____			

Section IV - Student Performance

Institution

Address

Name of Person Completing Form

Title

Directions: Please indicate whether the following types of data are **COL(Collected), NC(Not Collected)** or **USED** by your institution.

1. The following types of data are collected or used to assess student performance:	COL	NC	USED
a. Grades			
b. Standardized Test Scores (Identify the tests)			
_____			
c. Practicum supervisors' reports			
d. Internship site reports			
e. Employers' surveys of graduates			
f. Graduating senior surveys			
g. Student exit interviews			
h. Placement tests in			
1. English			
2. Writing			
3. Mathematics			
4. Other _____			
_____			

Directions: The following questions require a **YES** or **No** answer.	YES		NO
2. Data on student participation in tutorials is used to supplement information on student performance.			
3. Data on learning resource center activities is used to supplement information on student performance.			
4. Data on student course load is used to supplement information on student performance.			
5. Data on student work schedules is used to supplement information on student performances.			

Section V - Faculty Performance

Institution

Address

Name of Person Completing Form

Title

Directions: Please indicate whether the following types of data are **COL (Collected)**, **NC (Not Collected)** or **USED (Used)** by your institution.

1. The following types of data are collected or used to assess faculty performance:	COL	NC	USED
a. Faculty evaluations completed by chair			
b. Peer evaluations			
c. Student evaluations			
d. Publications in refereed journals			
e. Other publications			
f. Teaching skills assessments			
g. Committee assignments			
h. Faculty grantsmanship			
i. Faculty conference presentation (s)			
j. Attendance at professional meetings			
k. Professional association leadership			
l. Membership in professional organizations			
m. Research			
n. Statistical data on faculty advisement of students			
o. Other (Describe) _____			
_____	**YES**		**NO**
Directions: The following questions require a **YES** or **No** answer.			
2. Faculty formally rate their own performance.			
3. Faculty have a formal mechanism for responding to supervisor's ratings of their performance.			
4. Faculty formally rate their supervisors.			
5. Faculty vote for department chairs.			
6. The faculty is unionized.			
7. If yes, does the union contract include faculty performance measures.			

Section VI - Student Support Services Measures

Institution _____ Address _____

Name of Person Completing Form _____ Title _____

Directions: Please indicate whether the following types of data are **COL (Collected)**, **NC (Not Collected)** or **USED (Used)** by your institution.

1. The following types of data are collected or used to assess student support services:	COL	NC	USED
a. Student use of the library			
b. Number of students using the tutorial center			
c. Numbers of students using learning resources center			
d. Financial aid data			
e. Student participation rates in student activities			
f. Student clubs and organizations participation rates			
g. Student participation in residence life hall			
h. Data on student use of the counseling center			
i. Data on student use of advisement by support personnel			
j. Data on student use of career services			
k. Student satisfaction surveys in the following areas:			
Library			
Tutorial center			
Support personnel advisement			
Financial aid office			
Student activities office			
Career services			
Student clubs and organizations			
Residence life halls			
Counseling center			
Other _____			
_____			
Directions: The following questions require a **YES** or **No** answer.	**YES**		**NO**
2. Student support services personnel are evaluated annually.			
3. Student support services personnel evaluate their supervisors.			

Section VII - Fiscal Accountability Data

Institution	
	Address
Name of Person Completing Form	**Title**

Directions: Please indicate whether the following types of data are **COL (Collected)**, **NC (Not Collected)** or **USED (Used)** by your institution.

1. The following types of data are collected to demonstrate fiscal accountability:	COL	NC	USED
a. Institutional budget trends			
b. Management letters			
c. Audited reports			
d. Financial policies			
e. Financial controls			
f. Other (Describe)			
_____			
_____			
_____			
_____			

Section VIII - Trustee/Board Impact

Institution

Address

Name of Person Completing Form

Title

Directions: Please indicate whether the following types of data are **COL (Collected)**, **NC (Not collected)** or **USED (Used)** or by your institution.

1. The following types of data are collected or used to demonstrate trustee board impact:	COL	NC	USED
a. Attendance at board meetings			
b. Committee assignments			
c. Committee leadership positions			
d. Fundraising effectiveness			
e. Personal donations			
f. Advocacy			
g. Other (Describe) _____			
_____			
_____			
_____			